



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/047,280	01/14/2002	Yung Yip	10305US01	4504

7590 02/16/2005

Attention: Eric D. Levinson
Imation Corp.
Legal Affairs
P.O. Box 64898
St. Paul, MN 55164-0898

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, TANH Q

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2182

DATE MAILED: 02/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/047,280	Applicant(s) YIP ET AL.	
	Examiner Tanh Q. Nguyen	Art Unit 2182	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10/04/04 and RCE filed 11/15/04.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 and 26-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 and 26-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 14 January 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 10/04/2004 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-2, 4-5, 7-8, 10, 14-15, 18, 26-27, 29-31, 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by **Greco (US 2003/0070056 A1)**.

3. As per claim 1, **Greco** discloses a system [FIG. 1] comprising:

a data cartridge [40, FIG. 2] carrying a non-tape storage medium [11, FIG. 1], wherein the data cartridge includes read/write circuitry [12, FIG. 1 and FIG.2] to access

the non-tape storage medium and an external electrical connector coupled to the read/write circuitry [18, FIG. 1; 48, FIG. 2]; and

a tape drive emulator [10, 17, FIG. 1; 209, 210, 215, 216, 218, FIG. 7; [0044]-[0045]; [0069]-[0084]] having an electrical socket [19, FIG. 1; 140, FIG. 3] to receive the electrical connector of the data cartridge.

4. As per claims 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 14, 15, 18, Greco discloses a socket having a set of connectors that engage the electrical connections of the data cartridge using a normal force on the cartridge ([0036]-[0040]), hence the socket being a zero insertion force socket – claim 2;

the socket including a mechanical actuation mechanism operable by a data cartridge library automation system [90, FIG. 4] to electrically couple the data cartridge to the tape drive emulator ([0042]-[0043]) – claim 4;

the tape drive emulator comprising a host interface [15, FIG. 1] to electrically couple the tape drive emulator to a host computing device [14, FIG. 1] – claim 5;

the tape drive emulator comprising a translation unit [209, 210, 215, 216, 218, FIG. 7] to translate commands between the host interface and the electrical socket, the translation unit receiving data stream commands from the host interface and translates the data stream commands into data block commands ([0044]-[0045]; [0069]-[0084]) – claims 7-8;

the non-tape storage medium comprising a disk-shaped storage medium [11, FIG. 1] – claim 10;

an automation unit [90, FIG. 4] to selectively retrieve the data cartridge [40, FIG.

Art Unit: 2182

4] from a plurality of data cartridges conforming to industry standard dimensions for magnetic tape data cartridges ([0033]) – claim 14;

the data cartridge comprising a housing conforming to industry standard dimensions for magnetic tape data cartridges ([0033]) – claim 15;

the host computing device not requiring reprogramming to handle the non-tape storage medium, and expecting a certain format (e.g. tape format), using normal commands (e.g. tape commands [0044]), hence the tape drive emulator identifying itself as an industry standard tape drive in response to a query from a host computing device – claim 18.

5. As per claims 26-27, 29-31, 36, see the rejections to claims 1-2, 4-5, 7, 18 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

8. Claims 3, 6, 12, 13, 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Greco** in view of **Albrecht et al. (US 2002/0159182 A1)**.

9. As per claims 3 and 28, Greco discloses the tape drive emulator including a loader [100, FIG. 3] mechanically actuating the electrical socket upon insertion of the data cartridge ([0040]), hence discloses the claimed invention except for the tape drive emulator including a sensor to sense the insertion of the data cartridge. Greco, however, discloses an example of a loader being described by copending US patent application S/N 09/842,030 by Albrecht - US 2002/0159182 A1 ([0039]).

Albrecht discloses a loader including sensors [115, 116, FIG. 14] for detecting a cartridge being inserted in the loader and enabling the loader to load the data cartridge ([0072]-[0073]; [0091]-[0092]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Albrecht's sensor in Greco's loader since Albrecht's loader was used as an example of a loader in Greco's tape drive emulator, and since the incorporation would allow Greco's tape drive emulator to detect a cartridge being inserted in the loader and enable the loader to load the data cartridge.

10. As per claim 6, Greco discloses the claimed invention except for the host interface conforming to one of the SCSI, the Fiber Channel, the NDMP and the EIDE/ATA interfaces. Greco, however, discloses an embodiment of a data cartridge

being described by copending US patent application S/N 09/842,030 by Albrecht - US 2002/0159182 A1 ([0033]).

Albrecht discloses the data cartridge communicating at the data transfer interface using the SCSI format ([0055]), hence the tape drive emulator communicating with the data cartridge using an interface conforming to the SCSI interface. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a host interface conforming to the SCSI interface to maintain compatibility between the tape drive emulator and the host computing device.

Since Greco discloses an embodiment of a data cartridge being described by Albrecht, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a SCSI interface as the host interface in Greco's tape drive emulator to enable data transfer between the host computing device and the tape drive emulator and to maintain compatibility between the tape drive emulator and the host computing device.

It is further noted that since there are a plethora of interface formats that can be used as the host interface format to enable communication between the host computing device and the tape drive emulator, there is no patentability in using a host interface with a particular format.

11. As per claim 12, Greco discloses the claimed invention except for the data cartridge comprising a disk drive controller to control access to the non-tape storage medium, wherein the controller communicates with the tape drive emulator according to one of the SCSI, the Fiber Channel, the NDMP and the EIDE/ATA interfaces. Greco,

however, discloses an embodiment of a data cartridge being described by copending US patent application S/N 09/842,030 by Albrecht - US 2002/0159182 A1 ([0033]).

Since it was well known in the art at the time the invention was made for a disk drive to comprise a disk drive controller to control access to the disk, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a disk controller in Greco's data cartridge to allow Greco's data cartridge to control access to the non-tape storage medium.

Albrecht discloses the data cartridge communicating at the data transfer interface using the SCSI format ([0055]), hence the data cartridge communicating with the tape drive emulator using an interface conforming to the SCSI interface.

Since Greco discloses an embodiment of a data cartridge being described by Albrecht, and since Albrecht discloses the data cartridge communicating with the tape drive emulator using an interface conforming to the SCSI interface, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a disk drive controller that use SCSI interface in Greco's data cartridge to control access to the non-tape storage medium.

It is further noted that since there are a plethora of interface formats that can be used to allow the disk drive controller to communicate with the tape drive emulator, there is no patentability in using a particular interface format for communication between the disk drive controller and the tape drive emulator.

12. As per claim 13. Greco discloses the claimed invention except for the socket of the tape drive emulator providing power to the controller of the data cartridge via the

electrical connector of the data cartridge. Greco, however, discloses an embodiment of a data cartridge ([0033]) and an example of a loader ([0039]) being described by copending US patent application S/N 09/842,030 by Albrecht - US 2002/0159182 A1.

Albrecht discloses the socket [130, FIG. 11; 141, FIG. 23] of the transfer station (loader [100, FIG. 11 and FIG. 23]) providing power to the data cartridge [40, FIG. 23] via the electrical connector [48, FIG. 3] of the data cartridge ([0096]-[0097]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Albrecht's power transfer from the loader to the data cartridge in Greco's system since Albrecht's loader was used as an example of a loader in Greco's tape drive emulator and Albrecht's data cartridge was used as an embodiment of Greco's data cartridge, and since such incorporation would allow Greco's tape drive emulator to provide power to operate the disk drive of the data cartridge.

13. Claims 9, 19, 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Greco** in view of **Plotkin et al. (USP 5,297,124)**.

14. As per claim 9, Greco discloses the claimed invention except for the translation unit specifically comprising a data buffer for buffering the data stream commands.

Plotkin discloses a tape drive emulator comprising a data buffer [24, FIG. 1] for buffering the data stream commands (col. 3, lines 18-19).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Plotkin's data buffer into Greco's translation unit to allow for buffering of the data stream commands in the translation unit.

15. As per claims 19 and 37, Greco discloses the claimed invention except for the tape drive emulator determining the capacity of the non-tape storage medium within the data cartridge and communicating the capacity to a host computing device. Greco, however, discloses a plurality of non-tape storage media ([0070]), hence the need to determine the capacity of the corresponding storage medium and to communicate the capacity to the host computing device for proper storage allocation and operation.

Plotkin discloses the tape drive emulator determining the capacity of the non-tape storage medium within the data cartridge and communicating the capacity to a host computing device (col. 3, lines 48-52) to allow for proper translation between tape and non-tape format (Abstract, lines 11-14).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Plotkin's teachings of the capacity of the non-tape storage medium in Greco's non-tape storage medium for the purpose of providing the capacity of Greco's non-tape storage medium to the host computing device to ensure proper storage allocation and operation and to allow for proper translation between tape and non-tape format.

16. Claims 11, 32-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Greco**.

17. As per claim 11, Greco further discloses the data cartridge [40, FIG. 2] including a self-contained disk drive [12, FIG. 1 and FIG. 2] housing the disk-shaped storage

medium [11, FIG. 1], therefore discloses the claimed invention except for the disk drive housing a disk drive controller.

Since it was well known in the art at the time the invention was made for a disk drive to comprise a disk drive controller to control access to the disk, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a disk controller in Greco's data cartridge to allow Greco's data cartridge to control access to the non-tape storage medium.

18. As per claims 32-33, Greco further discloses the non-tape storage medium comprising a disk-shaped storage medium [11, FIG. 1], therefore discloses the claimed invention except for the tape drive emulator comprising a disk drive controller.

Since it was well known in the art at the time the invention was made for a disk drive to comprise a disk drive controller to control access to the disk, and since it has been held that rearranging parts of an invention involves only routine skill in the art (*In re Japikse*, 86 USPQ 70), it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a disk controller in Greco's tape drive emulator to allow Greco's tape drive emulator to control access to the non-tape storage medium.

19. Claims 16-17 and 34-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Greco** in view of **Albrecht et al.** and further in view of **Goodman et al.** (US 2002/0169521 A1).

Albrecht discloses the tape drive emulator having a form factor such that the location of the socket [120, 130, FIG. 11] conforms to the location of a slot within the industry standard tape drive [FIGs. 11, 20, 22] and the tape drive emulator comprising a power connector [130, FIG. 11; 141, FIG. 23] and one or more mounting holes [155, 156, FIG. 11], with the location of the power connector and the location of the mounting holes conforming to the industry standard tape drive ([0069]; [0075]; [0084]-[0086]; [0088]), therefore disclosed the claimed invention except for the dimensions of the tape drive emulator specifically conforming to the industry standard tape drive.

Goodman discloses a data storage library featuring multipurpose slots, each configured to receive a media drive (e.g. IBM 3570 tape drive: [0031], [0040]) or other various modules (Abstract, lines 1-6) to allow the data storage library to be easily updated with new equipment ([0004]), the other various modules including storage emulators ([0009]), hence teaches the storage emulators having a form factor conforming to the industry standard tape drive.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the dimensions of Greco/Albrecht's tape drive emulator to conform to the industry standard tape drive because such dimensions would allow for easy replacement of existing tape drives with tape drive emulators and therefore updating the data storage library with new equipment without wasting the slots in a data storage library such as Goodman's data storage library.

Further, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the dimensions of Greco/Albrecht's tape drive emulator to

conform to the industry standard tape drive, since such a modification would have involved a mere change in the size of a component. A change in size is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Rose*, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955).

Response to Arguments

20. The declaration filed on October 4, 2004 under 37 CFR 1.131 has been considered but is ineffective to overcome the Greco reference (US2003/0070056 A1).

21. The evidence submitted is insufficient to establish a conception of the invention prior to the effective date of the Greco reference. While conception is the mental part of the inventive act, it must be capable of proof, such as by demonstrative evidence or by a complete disclosure to another. Conception is more than a vague idea of how to solve a problem. The requisite means themselves and their interaction must also be comprehended. See *Mergenthaler v. Scudder*, 1897 C.D. 724, 81 O.G. 1417 (D.C. Cir. 1897). Per MPEP 715,

The essential thing to be shown under 37 CFR 1.131 is priority of invention and this may be done by any satisfactory evidence of the fact. **FACTS, not conclusions, must be alleged.** Evidence in the form of exhibits may accompany the affidavit or declaration. **Each exhibit relied upon should be specifically referred to in the affidavit or declaration, in terms of what it is relied upon to show.**

A general allegation that the invention was completed prior to the date of the reference is not sufficient. Ex parte Saunders, 1883 C.D. 23, 23 O.G. 1224 (Comm'r Pat. 1883). Similarly, a declaration by the inventor to the effect that his or her invention was conceived or reduced to practice prior to the reference date, **without a statement of facts demonstrating the correctness of this conclusion, is insufficient to satisfy 37 CFR 1.131.**

When reviewing a 37 CFR 1.131 affidavit or declaration, the examiner must consider all of the evidence presented in its entirety, including the affidavits or declarations and all accompanying exhibits, records and "notes."

Art Unit: 2182

An accompanying exhibit need not support all claimed limitations, provided that any missing limitation is supported by the declaration itself. Ex parte Ovshinsky, 10 USPQ2d 1075 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1989).

The affidavit or declaration and exhibits must clearly explain which facts or data applicant is relying on to show completion of his or her invention prior to the particular date. Vague and general statements in broad terms about what the exhibits describe along with a general assertion that the exhibits describe a reduction to practice "amounts essentially to mere pleading, unsupported by proof or a showing of facts" and, thus, does not satisfy the requirements of 37 CFR 1.131(b). In re Borkowski, 505 F.2d 713, 184 USPQ 29 (CCPA 1974). Applicant must give a clear explanation of the exhibits pointing out **exactly** what facts are established and relied on by applicant. 505 F.2d at 718-19, 184 USPQ at 33. See also In re Harry, 333 F.2d 920, 142 USPQ 164 (CCPA 1964) (Affidavit "asserts that facts exist but does not tell what they are or when they occurred.").

In general, proof of actual reduction to practice requires a showing that the apparatus actually existed and worked for its intended purpose.

The declaration and the accompanying exhibit do not provide enough evidence to support all the claimed limitations prior to the reference date, therefore does not support conception of the claimed invention. For example, the examiner notes that in declaring "As evidenced by this Declaration and Exhibit A referenced by this Declaration, we conceive at a time prior to October 5, 2001 that the tape drive emulator comprise a ZIF socket and a sensor to sense the insertion of the data cartridge and mechanically actuate the ZIF socket, as required by claim 3" (page 3, lines 8-11 of the Supplemental Declaration Under 37 C.F. R. 1.131), applicant did not give a clear explanation pointing out **exactly** what facts are established and relied upon from Exhibit A, and what facts are established and relied upon from the Declaration with respect to this particular limitation. Further, there is no clear explanation, from the Declaration or Exhibit A, on the specifics of how the sensor sense the insertion of the data cartridge and of how the tape drive emulator mechanically actuates the ZIF socket. **It is not sufficient for applicant to declare that the invention was conceived prior to the**

reference date without a statement of facts demonstrating the correctness of this conclusion.

The examiner further noted that applicant is not relying on Exhibit A to support the limitations of a significant number of claims (e.g. at least claims 3, 4, 6, 13, 14, 17, 18, 19); and for those claims, did not provide a statement of facts demonstrating that the claimed invention was conceived by applicant. However, it appears that at least for claims 18-19, applicant considers the limitations of these claims obvious.

22. Per MPEP 2138.06,

THE ENTIRE PERIOD DURING WHICH DILIGENCE IS REQUIRED MUST BE ACCOUNTED FOR BY EITHER AFFIRMATIVE ACTS OR ACCEPTABLE EXCUSES

An applicant must account for the entire period during which diligence is required. *Gould v. Schawlow*, 363 F.2d 908, 919, 150 USPQ 634, 643 (CCPA 1966) (Merely stating that there were no weeks or months that the invention was not worked on is not enough.); *In re Harry*, 333 F.2d 920, 923, 142 USPQ 164, 166 (CCPA 1964) (statement that the subject matter "was diligently reduced to practice" is not a showing but a mere pleading). A 2-day period lacking activity has been held to be fatal. *In re Mulder*, 716 F.2d 1542, 1545, 219 USPQ 189, 193 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (37 CFR 1.131 issue); *Fitzgerald v. Arbib*, 268 F.2d 763, 766, 122 USPQ 530, 532 (CCPA 1959) (Less than 1 month of inactivity during critical period. Efforts to exploit an invention commercially do not constitute diligence in reducing it to practice. An actual reduction to practice in the case of a design for a three-dimensional article requires that it should be embodied in some structure other than a mere drawing.); *Kendall v. Searles*, 173 F.2d 986, 993, 81 USPQ 363, 369 (CCPA 1949) (Diligence requires that applicants must be specific as to dates and facts.).

The period during which diligence is required must be accounted for by either affirmative acts or acceptable excuses. *Rebstock v. Flouret*, 191 USPQ 342, 345 (Bd. Pat. Inter. 1975); *Rieser v. Williams*, 225 F.2d 419, 423, 118 USPQ 96, 100 (CCPA 1958) (Being last to reduce to practice, party cannot prevail unless he has shown that he was first to conceive and that he exercised reasonable diligence during the critical period from just prior to opponent's entry into the field); *Griffith v. Kanamaru*, 816 F.2d 624, 2 USPQ2d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 1987) (Court generally reviewed cases on excuses for inactivity including vacation extended by ill health and daily job demands, and held lack of university funding and personnel are not acceptable excuses.); *Litchfield v. Eigen*, 535 F.2d 72, 190 USPQ 113 (CCPA 1976) (budgetary limits and availability of animals for testing not sufficiently described); *Morway v. Bondi*, 203 F.2d 741, 749, 97 USPQ 318, 323 (CCPA 1953) (voluntarily laying aside inventive concept in pursuit of other projects is generally not an acceptable excuse although there may be circumstances creating exceptions); *Anderson v. Crowther*, 152 USPQ 504, 512 (Bd. Pat. Inter. 1965) (preparation of routine

periodic reports covering all accomplishments of the laboratory insufficient to show diligence); *Wu v. Jucker*, 167 USPQ 467, 472-73 (Bd. Pat. Inter. 1968) (applicant improperly allowed test data sheets to accumulate to a sufficient amount to justify interfering with equipment then in use on another project); *Tucker v. Natta*, 171 USPQ 494,498 (Bd. Pat. Inter. 1971) ("[a]ctivity directed toward the reduction to practice of a genus does not establish, prima facie, diligence toward the reduction to practice of a species embraced by said genus"); *Justus v. Appenzeller*, 177 USPQ 332, 340-1 (Bd. Pat. Inter. 1971) (Although it is possible that patentee could have reduced the invention to practice in a shorter time by relying on stock items rather than by designing a particular piece of hardware, patentee exercised reasonable diligence to secure the required hardware to actually reduce the invention to practice. "[I]n deciding the question of diligence it is immaterial that the inventor may not have taken the expeditious course....").

The diligence of attorney in preparing and filing patent application inures to the benefit of the inventor. Conception was established at least as early as the date a draft of a patent application was finished by a patent attorney on behalf of the inventor. Conception is less a matter of signature than it is one of disclosure. Attorney does not prepare a patent application on behalf of particular named persons, but on behalf of the true inventive entity. **Six days to execute and file application is acceptable.** *Haskell v. Coleburne*, 671 F.2d 1362, 213 USPQ 192, 195 (CCPA 1982). See also *Bey v. Kollonitsch*, 866 F.2d 1024, 231 USPQ 967 (Fed. Cir. 1986) (Reasonable diligence is all that is required of the attorney. **Reasonable diligence is established if attorney worked reasonably hard on the application during the continuous critical period. If the attorney has a reasonable backlog of unrelated cases which he takes up in chronological order and carries out expeditiously, that is sufficient.** Work on a related case(s) that contributed substantially to the ultimate preparation of an application can be credited as diligence.).

The evidence submitted is insufficient to establish diligence from a date prior to the effective date of the Greco reference (October 5, 2001) to the US filing date of this application (January 14, 2002) because:

there are several periods lacking activity (**a 2-day period lacking activity has been held to be fatal**). There is no activity between 09/27/2001 and 09/30/2001; and there is no activity between 10/02/2001 and 10/08/2001 (see Exhibit B).

there is no statement by the attorney declaring "any period between October 9, 2001 and December 10, 2001 during which the invention was not worked on was due to normal attorney workload associated with the attorney's practice (page 10, paragraph 24).

there is no statement by the attorney declaring "any period between December 12, 2001 and December 21, 2001 during which the invention was not worked on was due to normal attorney workload associated with the attorney's practice (pages 10-11, paragraph 26).

there is no statement by the attorney declaring "any period between December 21, 2001 and January 14, 2002 during which the invention was not worked on was due to normal attorney workload associated with the attorney's practice (page 11, paragraph 27).

the activity on December 12, 2001 (page 10, paragraph 25) does not correspond with the items on Exhibit D.

Conclusion

23. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tanh Quang Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 305-0138, (or (571) 272-4154 after October 12, 2004) and whose e-mail address is tanh.nguyen36@uspto.gov. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey Gaffin, can be reached on (703) 308-3301 (or (571) 272-2100 after October 12, 2004). The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306 for After Final, Official, and Customer Services, or (703) 746-5672 (or (571) 273-4154 after October 12, 2004) for Draft to the Examiner

(please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT").


Effective May 1, 2003 are new mailing address is:

Mail Stop ____
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Effective December 1, 2003, hand-carried patent application related incoming correspondences will be to a centralized location.

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
2011 South Clark Place
Customer Window
Crystal Plaza Two, Lobby, Room 1B03
Arlington, VA 22202

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197.


JEFFREY GAFFIN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

TQN
February 6, 2005